

REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 24-61, 63-74, 76, 77 and 79-86 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 81-86 are newly added claims. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 80 and 82 are the independent claims.

The Examiner objected to Claim 54 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), indicating it was of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim (53). Applicant has amended Claims 53 and 54 in order to overcome the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 7, 76, and 77 under 35 U.S.C. 112, indicating that they failed to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended Claims 7, 76 and 77 to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 6, 7, 25, 42, 76, and 77 under 35 U.S.C. 112 because of the term "substantially". Applicant disagrees, but in order to expedite allowance of the claims, has removed the term "substantially" from all of the claims.

The Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 because of the term "capable". Applicant disagrees, but in order to expedite allowance of the claims, has removed the term "capable" from all of the claims.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nelson (US 5,838,542). Applicant disagrees. However, in order to expedite allowance of the claims, Applicant has amended Claim 1 in order to add the following limitations:

"said at least one microchip including at least one inner firewall being configured to deny access to said at least one control unit from said at least one network;

said at least one inner firewall being located between said at least one control unit and at least one of said at least two processing units;

said at least two processing units having at least one network connection to at least one network of computers; and

said at least one network of computers including at least the Internet.”

These limitations are not present in Nelson, and are supported, for example, in Applicant’s application in FIGURES 10A-10D, 10J-10Q, 16R-16U, 16X-16AA, 17C-17D, 20A-20B, 21A-21B, 22A, and 23A-23E, and the associated text. Applicant thus submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Nelson, as well as the other cited art. Claims 2-79 and 84-86 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 1, and are patentable for the same reasons.

The Examiner rejected Claim 80 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Palmer (US 5,861,817). Applicant disagrees. However, in order to expedite allowance of the claims, Applicant has amended Claim 80 in order to add the limitation of at least one general purpose microprocessor with “at least one photovoltaic cell located on said at least one microchip”. This limitation is not present in Palmer, and is supported in Applicant’s application in FIGURES 26A-26C and associated text. Applicant thus submits that Claim 80 is patentable over Nelson, as well as the other cited art. Claim 82 includes this same limitation and thus is also patentable. Claims 81 and 83 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 80 or 82, and are patentable for the same reasons.

It should be noted that Applicant has changed the phrase “comprising . . . a” to “comprising . . . at least one” throughout the claims to make explicit that “comprising . . . a” means “comprising . . . one or more”. This is consistent with the meaning of the claims in all of

Applicant's other patents and patent applications, even though the claims in these other patents and patent applications have not been changed to "comprising . . . at least one".

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP



Dale Lazar
Registration No. 28,872

Lisa K. Norton
Registration No. 44,977

PO Box 9271
Reston, Virginia 20195-3171
Telephone No. (703) 773-4149
Facsimile No. (703) 773-5200